

**REMARKS**

In response to the Final Office Action dated June 26, 2008, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-3, 8-9, 14-16, 18, and 20 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 8, and 14 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated June 26, 2008, Claims 1-3, 8-9, 14-16, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and § 103(a), and Claims 8-9 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Following this response, Claims 1-3, 8-9, 14, 16, 18, and 20 remain in this application with Claim 15 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. **Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

In the Final Office Action dated June 26, 2008, the Examiner rejected Claims 8-9 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 14 has been amended to recite a computer readable “storage” media, and Claim 8 has been amended to recite a system operative to present forms and publish form data. Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

## II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 8-9, 14-16, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. Specifically, the Examiner stated that it is unclear as to what would happen if it was determined that a previously compiled class is to be used, as the claim is missing an alternate statement. Claims 1, 8, and 14 have been amended to recite a step in response to a determination that a previously compiled class is to be used. Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

## III. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 8-9, 14-16, and 18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 8-9, 14-16, and 18 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,999,948 ("*Nelson*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,496,843 ("*Getchius*"). Claims 1, 8, and 14 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, overcome the cited references and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "a field name for the at least one form field, wherein the field name specifies the at least one form field that is to be utilized to identify response data submitted for the at least one form field, a form name for the at least one form field, wherein the form name identifies a particular form associated with the at least

one form field." Amended Claims 8 and 14 each includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 10, lines 12-18

Consistent with exemplary embodiments of the invention, a form name field may identify a particular Web form associated with a particular field. (See specification page 10, lines 12-13.) A field name may specify a name that should be utilized to identify a filed and response data submitted for the field. (See specification page 10, lines 13-14.) A data type field may comprise data indicating what input field type should be displayed. (See specification page 10, lines 14-15.) For instance, the data type field may indicate that a text field for entering numbers, words, or other small text portions, a text area field for free-form, multi-line text entries, a radio button, or other input field types should be displayed. (See specification page 10, lines 15-18.)

In contrast, and as stated by the Examiner, *Nelson* does not disclose data identifying a field name, a form name, a data type, and a version for a form field. (See Office Action, page 6, point 8.) Furthermore, and as stated by the Examiner, *Nelson* does not disclose a field engine operative to retrieve the data elements. (See Office Action, page 4, lines 14-15.) Consequently, because *Nelson* fails to disclose these data elements, *Nelson* cannot disclose respective data element functionality, such as a field name specifying a form field name utilized to retrieve response data or data types indicating an input field type.

Furthermore, *Getchius* does not overcome *Nelson*'s deficiencies. For example, *Getchius* merely discloses that an external process may copy blob data from multiple tables in which an associated field name may differ with each table. (See col. 52, lines 31-32.) In *Getchius*, the external process uses the field name to retrieve the blob data

to be copied. (See col. 53, lines 33-34.) However, *Getchius* at least fails to disclose a data type indicating a form field input type. Consequently, *Getchius* cannot disclose retrieving form fields of a particular data type.

Combining *Nelson* with *Getchius* would not have led to the claimed subject matter because *Nelson* and *Getchius*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose "a field name for the at least one form field, wherein the field name specifies the at least one form field that is to be utilized to identify response data submitted for the at least one form field, a form name for the at least one form field, wherein the form name identifies a particular form associated with the at least one form field," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 8 and 14 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 8, and 14 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited references, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 8, and 14.

Dependent Claims 2-3, 9, 16, and 18 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 8, and 14, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 8, and 14. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-3, 9, 16, and 18.

#### IV. Rejection of Claim 20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 20 as being unpatentable over *Nelson* in view of *Getchius* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,718,515 ("*Conner*"). Claim 20 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the

reason that it includes, due to its dependency on amended independent Claim 1, for example, "a field name for the at least one form field, wherein the field name specifies the at least one form field that is to be utilized to identify response data submitted for the at least one form field, a form name for the at least one form field, wherein the form name identifies a particular form associated with the at least one form field." Support for this amendment can be found in the specification at least on page 10, lines 12-18.

As stated above, consistent with exemplary embodiments of the invention, a form name field may identify a particular Web form associated with a particular field. (See specification page 10, lines 12-13.) A field name may specify a name that should be utilized to identify a field and response data submitted for the field. (See specification page 10, lines 13-14.) A data type field may comprise data indicating what input field type should be displayed. (See specification page 10, lines 14-15.) For instance, the data type field may indicate that a text field for entering numbers, words, or other small text portions, a text area field for free-form, multi-line text entries, a radio button, or other input field types should be displayed. (See specification page 10, lines 15-18.)

As established above, *Nelson* at least does not disclose not disclose data identifying a field name, a form name, a data type, and a version for a form field. Consequently, because *Nelson* fails to disclose these data elements, *Nelson* cannot disclose respective data element functionality. Furthermore, *Getchius* does not overcome *Nelson's* deficiencies. Like *Nelson*, *Getchius* fails to disclose fails to disclose a data type indicating a form field input type. Consequently, *Getchius* cannot disclose retrieving form fields of a particular data type.

Moreover, *Conner* does not overcome *Nelson's* and *Getchius'* deficiencies.

*Conner* merely discloses creating a table format object and using the object to generate an HTML table as a dynamic page in response to a client browser. (See col. 5, lines 11-14.) A routine in *Conner* begins by creating a table format object called a tableFormatter. (See col. 5, lines 14-16.) *Conner's* object is created during a page authoring process. (See col. 5, lines 16-17.) In response to a client request, a requested object and data object are passed to *Conner's* tableFormatter that formats the table for use in a page. (See col. 5, lines 38-44.) *Conner* merely discloses creating a table in a web page from hard-coded properties. *Conner*, therefore, cannot disclose utilizing a field engine table to retrieve data types corresponding to an indicated input field type.

Combining *Nelson* with *Getchius* and *Conner* would not have led to the claimed subject matter because *Nelson*, *Getchius*, and *Conner*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose "a field name for the at least one form field, wherein the field name specifies the at least one form field that is to be utilized to identify response data submitted for the at least one form field, a form name for the at least one form field, wherein the form name identifies a particular form associated with the at least one form field," as included in dependent Claim 20 by virtue of its dependency on amended independent Claim 1. Accordingly, dependent Claim 20 patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited references, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 20.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Final Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Final Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
404.954.5066

/D. Kent Stier/

Date: August 20, 2008

---

D. Kent Stier  
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:mdc

